

**INTERNATIONAL SECURITY / MIDDLE EAST UPDATE**  
**June 10 - 17, 2010**

1. [United States Builds on Iran Sanctions](#) (06-16-2010)
2. [A Long March to Human Rights in Iran](#) (06-16-2010)
3. [The New START Treaty](#) (06-15-2010)
4. [State Department's Policy Priorities on Trafficking in Persons](#) (06-14-2010)
5. [U.S. Aids Victims of Ethnic Violence in Kyrgyzstan](#) (06-14-2010)
6. [Clinton on Anniversary of Iran's Disputed Presidential Election](#) (06-14-2010)
7. [Open Skies Treaty Fulfills Arms Control Needs](#) (06-11-2010)
8. [Statement on Visit of Russian President Medvedev to White House](#) (06-11-2010)

-----

**1. [United States Builds on Iran Sanctions](#) (06-16-2010)**

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.  
Staff Writer

Washington — U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner announced new financial measures that target Iran's nuclear and missile programs and bolster recent U.N. Security Council sanctions aimed at curbing Iran's nuclear ambitions.

"Today's actions also highlight for the international community Iran's use of its financial sector, shipping industry and Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to carry out and mask its proliferation activities," [a Treasury Department fact sheet](#) said. The steps respond to the Security Council's call for nations to prevent their financial systems from being abused by Iran.

"We are adding to our list of sanction entities a number of institutions and individuals who are helping Iran finance nuclear and missile programs and to evade international sanctions," Geithner told reporters.

Geithner and Stuart Levey, Treasury's under secretary for terrorism and financial intelligence, presented the expanded financial measures at a June 16 White House briefing. The European Union

also has agreed to move forward on plans for additional measures beyond the Security Council-imposed sanctions approved June 9.

The measures unveiled at the White House block U.S. transactions with listed businesses and banks, and seek to freeze any assets of the entities held in U.S. jurisdiction. An additional impact of U.S. and U.N. measures is that businesses around the world are becoming conscious of the implications of any trade that they conduct with Iran's energy companies, Levey told reporters.

Treasury added Iran's Post Bank for providing financial services to and acting on behalf of Bank Sepah, which was designated by Treasury officials in 2007 for its support of Iran's missile industry, including two companies directly linked to Iran's ballistic missile program – Shahid Bakeri Industries Group and Shaid Hemmat Industries Group. Bank Sepah later was designated by the United Nations in March 2007.

According to the Treasury Department, Post Bank, working on behalf of Bank Sepah, arranged millions of dollars worth of business between Hong Kong Electronics and other overseas beneficiaries. Hong Kong Electronics was added to the Treasury list in June 2009 for providing support to several North Korean entities; North Korea is also under U.N. Security Council sanction for its nuclear weapons program.

Geithner said that with the addition of Post Bank, it brings the number of Iranian-owned banks on the sanctions list to 16.

"We are adding five front companies and more than 90 ship names that Iran's national maritime carrier has been using to try to evade sanctions," Geithner said. Treasury is also adding two individuals and two entities that are actively involved in Iran's nuclear and missile programs.

The new sanctions were imposed against the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps' air force and missile commands, which are key elements in the operational deployment of Iran's ballistic missile capability. Also added to the sanctions list were Rah Sahel and Sepanir Oil and Gas Engineering Company, Treasury said.

Geithner said Treasury added 22 petroleum, energy and insurance companies, inside and outside Iran, that are owned or controlled by the Iranian government.

Levey said additional sanctions were imposed against Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines (IRISL) and front companies.

"Since we first sanctioned IRISL in 2008, it has desperately attempted to evade those sanctions, setting up new front companies, renaming and reflagging and even repainting its vessels to hide their true ownership," Levey said. "Despite its deceptive maneuvers, IRISL has had to struggle to obtain insurance and other services that it needs."

House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Howard L. Berman issued a statement supporting Treasury's new designations.

"I strongly support today's action by the Treasury Department to designate dozens of Iranian entities and individuals as contributors to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction," Berman said. "These designations will significantly extend the reach of comprehensive Iran sanctions legislation that Congress will soon pass, reinforcing and augmenting the international sanctions

regime so that we can achieve our goal of persuading Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment program, in accordance with the demands of the international community.”

Levey said that if the Iranian government holds to previous patterns, it will attempt to find ways to work around these additional measures, “hiding behind front companies, doctoring wire transfers, falsifying shipping documents. We will continue to expose this deception.”

---

## **2. A Long March to Human Rights in Iran (06-16-2010)**

**Protesters on Washington streets expect a tough road but aren't discouraged**

By Jeff Baron  
Staff Writer

Washington — Negar says that when she and her friends poured onto the streets of Tehran in June 2009 to protest the official results of the Iranian presidential election, they were sure that they had altered Iran's future.

“Everything changed in one night. Unbelievable,” she said.

Well, not quite everything: Despite the protests, the government of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad remains in office with the support of the country's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamanei. But Negar, who asked that her full name not be used to protect her and her family from retribution by the Iranian government, said she thinks the events of June 2009 have made change a certainty. And so on the anniversary of the election, Negar — now a graduate student in the United States — was on the streets again June 12, this time in Washington with hundreds of Iranian Americans, fellow Iranian students and others demanding human rights in Iran.

This isn't what she and other students expected a year ago, she said.

“We chatted on Facebook, with our professors even. I can remember our professor talked to us and said, ‘Be calm, be calm. It's just the beginning of the change.’ ... It takes a whole year? We didn't expect it.”

Protesters interviewed on the streets of Washington during the anniversary offered different views on how long the campaign for human rights in Iran will take, but none admitted to being discouraged. They did complain a bit about the heat — the day reached a sticky 93 degrees Fahrenheit (34 Celsius) — and about missing World Cup matches on television. They also grew hoarse from chanting, first outside the office that represents Iranian interests in the United States and then through the streets of Washington to Freedom Plaza in the center of the city.

“At this time, we should be at home and watch soccer,” said a 54-year-old Iranian American who, like many others, asked that his name not be used to protect relatives in Iran. “You can realize how important this issue is for us, so everybody came out in the hot weather to send a message to all the world: ‘Hey, we have a problem. Help us to fix this problem.’ And hopefully send a message to our leader President Obama to stop this nonsense. Don't make it worse, just stop it right now.”

Ken Nooshi had driven more than three hours from Norfolk, Virginia, with his wife, two sons and some friends. Like the others, he wore a mask in the colors of the Iranian flag with “democracy” written above the eyes and “freedom” below them.

“This is the second year that I’m doing this — after this lady was killed,” Nooshi said, gesturing to a picture of [Neda Salehi Agha Soltan](#), who was fatally shot during a street protest in Tehran in June 2009. In his many years in the United States before that, Nooshi said, he paid some attention to what was happening in his native Iran, but did nothing.

Marchers stopped near the White House, lifted photos of slain protester Neda Salehi Agha Soltan and chanted, “We are all Neda.” Although a few protesters carried signs with photos of Mir-Hossein Moussavi, the opposition candidate who they said would have defeated Ahmadinejad in a fair vote, their calls were for democracy, not Moussavi.

“I’m not here for any political position. I’m just here for basic human rights,” said a woman who marched alongside her two young daughters.

The woman said that, as an Iranian Kurd, she has an extra reason for opposing a government that has treated her people harshly. “Every family has lost one or two, or they have been in prison,” including herself, she said, jailed for two years for reading forbidden material — at age 14.

Reza Azimi, 23, a graduate student at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh, led the chanting for a while with his booming voice — no need for a megaphone. Afterward, he said this protest movement is different from the ones that came before it. “Thirty years after the revolution, this is the first time that people don’t stop. They really don’t want to stop,” he said. What’s more, he added, this movement is subjecting the supreme leader to unprecedented criticism. “This time, everything has changed. People know who is on the top, who is on the top of the dictatorship, and they want him down. ... They’re never going to stop.”

Azimi said he will keep protesting too. “I know that my parents, my brothers, my sisters and all our families in Iran, they are doing that. They’re going on the streets, really not scared of anything. We just have to show them that we are supporting them. We are not in Iran, we cannot fight with them directly, but at least we can tell them that spiritually we are supporting them.”

Not all the protesters had a family connection to Iran. David and Claire Carr of the Washington suburb of Falls Church, Virginia, said they had studied Persian briefly in college and become interested in the culture and politics of Iran. They marched in the heat — their first political protest in the United States, they said — even though she is more than eight months pregnant.

An 18-year-old from another suburb of Washington who asked that his name not be used said he was inspired by the 2009 protests in the streets of Tehran. “I was so excited to see all these Iranian citizens turn out and say ‘no’ to their government for manipulating election results and in general just misgoverning the people and taking their rights away,” he said. “And even though people have less rights than they did a year ago, I think it’s very encouraging to see that a lot of people in Iran have shown their opposition to a bad government and that people abroad have shown their opposition to a government that doesn’t respect its own people.”

Iranian-American Art Light, 31, noted that many in the crowd in Washington, like the protesters in Tehran, are young. “A lot of the youth that are out here, they’re not tied to any previous politics,” he said. “They weren’t part of the revolution; they weren’t a part of the shah’s regime. So all they want is democracy and freedom, and they want to be able to do the same thing that people do in the U.S.: go to movies, hold their girlfriend’s hand, listen to music, go to a concert, be able to go to a university — those are the basic things they want.”

Although he called the changes in Iran in the past year “baby steps,” he added: “I don’t think anybody’s going to be discouraged. Suppression and brutal force can only hold a regime in for so long. History has proven that.”

An Iranian graduate student who has been in the United States for two years and didn’t want his name used called the past year’s protests in Iran “just the start.”

“Maybe 10 or 20 years” will be needed to change Iran’s government, he said, “but I think that we are on the right track.”

“No way we will win in the short term,” he said. “But maybe our funerals will be free.”

---

### **3. The New START Treaty (06-15-2010)**

Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Verification, Compliance, and Implementation  
Opening Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am very happy to have this opportunity today to provide my perspective as chief negotiator of the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, the “New START” Treaty, and to respond to your questions.

I believe there is every reason for the Senate to provide its advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty. The Treaty is a continuation of the international arms control and nonproliferation framework that the United States has worked hard to foster and strengthen for the last 50 years. It will provide ongoing transparency and predictability regarding the world’s two largest deployed nuclear arsenals, while preserving our ability to maintain the strong nuclear deterrent that remains an essential element of U.S. national security and the security of our allies and friends.

Presidents Obama and Medvedev described it best when, upon signing the Treaty on April 8 in Prague, President Obama called it “an important milestone for nuclear security and non-proliferation, and for U.S.-Russia relations” and President Medvedev declared it a “win-win situation.”

A little over a year ago, the Administration set out to negotiate the New START Treaty with the goal of replacing the expiring START Treaty with a new agreement mandating lower levels of strategic offensive arms. We were also determined to move beyond Cold War mentalities and chart a fresh start in our relations with Russia. The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review concluded that U.S. national security would not be negatively affected by a reduction in our nuclear arsenal, especially considering that the most immediate threats we face today are nuclear proliferation and terrorism. The United States could sustain a stable deterrence with significantly fewer deployed warheads and strategic delivery vehicles than permitted under earlier arms control agreements. It further recognized that we need to cooperate with Russia as our partner to meet these threats and other global challenges.

The negotiations benefited from our long experience with implementing the INF Treaty, the START Treaty, and the Moscow Treaty. We began with a far better understanding of each other’s strategic forces than we had when we were negotiating the original START agreement. Several

members of both delegations had extensive experience implementing the START Treaty, including inspections of strategic facilities. The U.S. negotiating team was especially rich in experienced inspectors, as Dr. Warner can attest.

Indeed, my colleague, Ted Warner, and I are two representatives of a strong interagency negotiating team that cooperated very effectively in agreeing, through a thorough interagency process, on the concept and substance of the Treaty. The strength of this new Treaty rests on the fact that we took into account the broad perspectives of the State Department, the Defense Department, the uniformed military, the Energy Department, and others at the outset and at every step throughout the negotiation process.

As I often noted during the negotiations, the New START Treaty is a hybrid of START and the Moscow Treaty – New START has its conceptual roots in both treaties. It contains a comprehensive verification regime as does START, to provide for predictability, but it recognizes that we are no longer in a Cold War relationship. Thus, it allows each Party to determine for itself the composition and structure of its strategic offensive arms and how reductions will be made. This flexibility is the great contribution of the Moscow Treaty, and it will be important to our national security as we move forward to further reductions.

The three central numerical limits in the New START Treaty will affect the Parties in different ways because our strategic forces are structured differently. Each Party must make decisions regarding its force structure with respect to all three limits. For example, Russia currently has fewer operational launchers than the United States, but it has a number of inactive submarines and ICBM launchers that it will have to eliminate in order to meet the aggregate limit of 800 deployed and non-deployed launchers and nuclear-capable heavy bombers.

The warhead counting rules in this Treaty are a significant innovation. The Parties will receive a realistic accounting of the number of reentry vehicles actually emplaced on each Party's deployed ICBMs and SLBMs, and the opportunity to monitor the declared numbers through on-site inspections. While neither Party carries any nuclear armaments on its bombers on a day-to-day basis, the Parties agreed to an attribution rule of one warhead per nuclear-capable heavy bomber rather than count them at zero. This attribution rule strikes a balance between the fact that neither side loads nuclear armaments on its bombers on a day-to-day basis and the fact that these bombers have a nuclear mission. Furthermore, heavy bombers have long been considered to be more stabilizing than ICBMs or SLBMs because, as "slow-flyers" compared to ballistic missiles, they are not well suited to be used as first-strike weapons.

The Treaty's verification regime will give us an important window into the Russian strategic arsenal. The regime includes extensive provisions that contribute to verification of the Parties' compliance, including notifications, data exchanges, agreed conversion and elimination procedures, inspections, demonstrations, and exhibitions. It also includes some significant innovations over the START verification regime, such as the provision of unique identifiers for all ICBMs, SLBMs, and heavy bombers, and reentry vehicle onsite inspections that are designed to monitor the exact number of reentry vehicles emplaced on individual missiles.

The verification regime will provide each Party confidence that the other is upholding its obligations, while also being simpler and less costly to implement than START. The regime reflects the improved U.S.-Russian relationship since the end of the Cold War and reduces the disruptions to operations at strategic nuclear forces facilities imposed by START.



The Treaty protects our ability to develop and deploy a conventional prompt global strike capability, should we pursue such a capability. As eminent Russian foreign policy expert Dr. Sergei Karaganov has noted, it was not possible for Russia to secure a ban on U.S. development and deployment of high-precision non-nuclear strategic systems.[1] We were firm during the negotiations that the Treaty must allow for strategic missiles in conventional configuration, and also that future non-nuclear systems of strategic range that do not otherwise meet the definitions of the Treaty should not be considered “new kinds of strategic offensive arms” for purposes of the Treaty.

The Administration shares the Congress’ concern that there should not be constraints on U.S. efforts to defend ourselves and our allies from missile attacks launched by third parties. The Treaty does not constrain our current or planned missile defenses, and in fact contains no meaningful restrictions on missile defenses of any kind. The preamble’s acknowledgement of the interrelationship between offensive and defensive arms is not new; it has been acknowledged for decades in prior strategic arms control treaties.

Moreover, for decades it has not been the policy of the United States to undermine the Soviet or Russian strategic offensive forces with ballistic missile defenses. Ronald Reagan, at the time he announced the Strategic Defense Initiative in 1983, said, “We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose -- one all people share -- is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.” Beginning with George H.W. Bush, our missile defense policy has focused on defending the United States, our troops, our friends and allies, from limited ballistic missile threats.

Regarding the unilateral statements on missile defense associated with the Treaty, the United States has made clear our intention to continue improving and deploying our missile defense systems, in order to defend ourselves and our allies against limited attacks. We did not agree to Russia’s unilateral statement, and the Russian statement in no way changes the legal rights or obligations of the Parties under the Treaty. The fact that Russia felt compelled to make its unilateral statement is, in fact, a striking piece of evidence that they were unable to restrict our missile defenses in any meaningful way in the agreement itself. Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Ryabkov said in an interview published in the newspaper “Russia Today” on April 19, “We have never ever believed that it would be possible through this Treaty, the scope of which covers exclusively strategic offensive arms, to be able to limit capabilities of another Party in the area of strategic defence.”[2]

In addition, Russian President Medvedev said in an interview with ABC News on April 9, “I would not want to create the impression that any change would be construed as grounds for suspending a treaty that we have only just signed. Moreover, we agreed – I discussed this with President Obama, and our respective administrations discussed it – that we should cooperate on building a global missile defence system. But if events develop in such a way as to ultimately change the fundamental situation Russia would be able to raise this issue with the USA.”[3]

To those who may have concerns regarding alleged back-room deals during the Treaty negotiations, let me state unequivocally today on the record before this Committee that there were no/no secret deals made in connection with the New START Treaty; not on missile defense or any other issue. Everything we agreed to is in the Treaty documents transmitted to the Senate on May 13. I also want to make clear that Article XV of the Treaty authorizes the Bilateral Consultative Commission to make changes in the Protocol without resorting to the Treaty amendment procedures only where such changes do not affect substantive rights or obligations under the Treaty. This provision is similar to the provisions contained in, and successfully implemented under, the START Treaty.

The New START Treaty represents a significant step forward in building a stable, cooperative relationship with Russia. But this Treaty is not just about Washington and Moscow. It advances the security of the entire world. By giving added stability and transparency to the relationship between the world's two largest nuclear powers and by demonstrating that we are living up to our obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), we enhance our credibility to convince other governments to help strengthen the international nonproliferation regime and confront proliferators.

Mr. Chairman, in sum, I believe that the New START Treaty is in the interests of the United States and is the right treaty for today. It will restore the transparency and predictability that START provided, preserve the flexibility enshrined in the Moscow Treaty, contribute to our efforts to reinvigorate the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and take us another step toward achieving the ultimate goal of a nuclear weapons-free world.

Thank you.

---

[1] <http://karaganov.ru/en/publications/preview/206>

[2] [http://rt.com/Top\\_News/2010-04-19/ryabkov-nuclear-programme-iran.html](http://rt.com/Top_News/2010-04-19/ryabkov-nuclear-programme-iran.html)

[3] <http://eng.news.kremlin.ru/transcripts/1>

---

#### **4. [State Department's Policy Priorities on Trafficking in Persons \(06-14-2010\)](#)** **Prosecution, protection, prevention and partnerships are key**

*The following article is part of the larger 2010 Trafficking in Persons Report (TIP). The Secretary of State submits this yearly report to Congress as required under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), the first comprehensive U.S. federal law to protect victims of trafficking and prosecute their traffickers. The TIP report defines various terms concerning human trafficking and defines a framework of prevention, protection and prosecution to combat trafficking in persons and to protect victims.*

U.S. Department of State  
June 14, 2010

Policy Priorities

### **OFFICE TO MONITOR AND COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS**

#### **[Trafficking in Persons Report 2010](#)**

Since the issuance of President Bill Clinton's Executive Memorandum on the Trafficking of Women and Children in March 1998, the U.S. government has advocated a policy structured by the "3P" paradigm: prosecution, protection, and prevention.

#### **Prosecution**

Trafficking in persons is a crime akin to murder, rape and kidnapping. Criminalization is mandatory for all parties to the Palermo Protocol, and the importance of prosecution is reflected in the U.S. law enforcement approach. Yet the numbers of prosecutions each year are dismally low in comparison to the scope of the problem. Passing modern laws that prohibit all forms of trafficking by focusing on the enslavement of victims rather than the recruitment and transportation of workers or people in



prostitution is an important first step in complying with the Palermo Protocol and meeting the TVPA minimum standards. For those laws to have any meaning, however, they must be enforced. As long as there are only around 4,000 trafficking convictions worldwide each year, a message is sent that the injustice suffered by victims is not a national or international priority.

Too often the victims of this crime are perceived to be society's throwaways – prostitutes, runaways, the poor, racial or ethnic minorities, members of a low caste, or recent immigrants. Victims themselves do not know the legal definitions of this crime and should not be required to self-identify. Bias against the vulnerable classes and an inability to envision them as victims affects whether they are identified and whether their traffickers are brought to justice. A narrow focus hinders a robust law enforcement response and allows traffickers to operate with impunity. Moreover, it diminishes the promise of equal protection under the law, undermining basic rule of law principles. All victims should be entitled to see their traffickers brought to justice and to be heard through the legal process. Compassionate and smart prosecution is thus the foundation of a victim-centered approach.

## **Protection**

Just as passage of a law without its enforcement is an empty promise, law enforcement alone without victim protections is an inadequate response. A victim-centered approach does not mean assisting a potential witness just long enough to get his or her testimony; it means meeting needs and fulfilling obligations that extend beyond the confines of a criminal case. Such an approach calls for partnerships between law enforcement agencies and service providers – not just to win the case but as colleagues sharing a humanitarian responsibility to act in the best interest of the victim.

Victim protections conditioned on victims' active role in prosecutions brought by the state also fall far short. In many countries, immigration relief and social services are offered only to victim-witnesses purely as incentives to cooperate. They do not aim to restore the dignity or health of the person who was victimized. Optimally, the response to this human rights abuse should focus on all victims, offering them the opportunity to access shelter, comprehensive services, and in certain cases, immigration relief. Repatriation of foreign victims should not be the first response, but should be undertaken as an informed decision and done so in a manner that serves the best interest of the victim. Detention of the victim is not only at odds with the Palermo Protocol, but is counterproductive to effective rehabilitation and criminal prosecution alike. At its best, victim protection is a series of laws and policies that are broadly funded, understood, and implemented, and that are adaptable on the ground and considerate of victims' needs.

## **Prevention**

While prevention is an important goal, neither the Palermo Protocol nor the TVPA as amended give much guidance in setting forth prevention activities beyond the obvious: public awareness campaigns, addressing root causes, and conducting law enforcement-related or border security activities. A decade later, governments are expanding their understanding of prevention to include policies and practices that cut off modern slavery at the source. This includes initiatives that both combat the demand for commercial sex and ensure that the demand for low prices is balanced by a demand for traceability, transparency, and worker protections throughout the supply chain. Governments, corporations, and consumers can come together to ensure that free trade means labor that is freely offered because of fair compensation, rather than labor taken for free.

Prevention must address key vulnerabilities in legal systems: policies and implementation loopholes that allow trafficking to occur, tolerance within government procurement and contracting,

unscrupulous labor recruiting companies, restrictive visa practices used as coercive tools, and lax enforcement of labor laws. Effective prevention lies in targeted initiatives to protect the rights of marginalized, low-income workers, such as domestic servants, farm workers, miners, and garment workers. These workers are too often subjected to offenses that span a continuum of labor exploitation, including at its worst, human trafficking.

Prevention also can and should harness the economic impetus for this crime in order to fight it – by increasing criminal or civil penalties for companies that directly rely on forced labor in the production of goods or services.

## **Partnerships**

Combating human trafficking requires the expertise, resources and efforts of many individuals and entities. It is a complex, multifaceted issue requiring a comprehensive response of government and nongovernment entities in such areas as human rights, labor and employment, health and services, and law enforcement. It requires partnerships among all these entities to have a positive impact.

Partnerships augment efforts by bringing together diverse experience, amplifying messages, and leveraging resources, thereby accomplishing more together than any one entity or sector would be able to alone. Examples of existing partnerships governments use to facilitate prosecution, prevention, and protection include:

- task forces among law enforcement agencies that cooperate to share intelligence, work across jurisdictions, and coordinate across borders;
- alliances between governments and business associations that seek to craft protocols and establish compliance mechanisms for slavery-free supply chains; and,
- regional partnerships among nations, such as the antihuman trafficking efforts of the Organization of American States (OAS) or the European Union (EU).

Outside the government, partnerships include coalitions of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) coming together for purposes of advocacy, service provision, and information sharing, and networks of survivors, whose experiences inform the broader trafficking movement.

While there is broad agreement on the purpose and benefits of a partnership approach to human trafficking, there is less agreement on and documentation of proven, successful strategies – something all should endeavor to create and share in the years ahead.

## **Dismantling the “3D” Approach to Human Trafficking**

In the 10 years since the passage of the Palermo Protocol with its “3P” paradigm of prevention, protection and prosecution, a competing, more unfortunate, paradigm seems to persist in impeding greater anti-trafficking progress: the “3D” phenomenon of detention, deportation and disempowerment.

The use of this approach in detaining and deporting trafficking victims is most often the outgrowth of immigration policies or archaic laws that have yet to fully appreciate the phenomenon of modern slavery. However, some of the manifestations of this response are new, appearing only in the last few years and affecting many more women than men.

In such a response, governments may act out of self interest in ridding themselves of potential burdens. Or they may act in what they claim is the best interest of foreign victims. This usually includes detaining the victims for a short period of time and then deporting them to their country of origin without offering them credible opportunities to seek legal redress (including civil restitution), adequate psychological repair, longer term residency and work, or relocation to a third country. Attempts to hold identified trafficking victims in detention-based facilities governments describe as “shelters” – no matter how comfortable and safe they may be – disempower victims at a critical time when they need a restored sense of individual freedom. Detention models undercut any rapport service providers or investigators might build with victims. Research and law enforcement practice indicates that initial trauma lasts for months and that victims can only give a partial account of their experiences in the early stages of an investigation; a response based on detention and repatriation – even if initial statements have been reduced to video or affidavit – will likely prevent law enforcement from arriving at critical facts.

Sending victims back to their countries of origin without informing them of a full range of options not only exposes them to possible trauma associated with being identified as a trafficking victim, but it also risks returning them to the same condition and exposing them to the same or even more enhanced pressures that contributed to their initial trafficking experience, thus raising the prospects for their re-trafficking. Furthermore, when a country jails and repatriates victims without screening or protection, NGOs are deterred from bringing their clients to the government’s attention.

---

## **5. U.S. Aids Victims of Ethnic Violence in Kyrgyzstan (06-14-2010)**

By Stephen Kaufman  
Staff Writer

Washington — The Obama administration wants a coordinated international response to address the ongoing ethnic violence in Kyrgyzstan and is providing humanitarian assistance for the victims, State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said.

Speaking to reporters June 14, Crowley said Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton spoke earlier in the day about the situation with the foreign minister of Kazakhstan, which borders Kyrgyzstan, and Crowley affirmed that U.S. officials are maintaining “very close touch” with the Kyrgyz Republic’s provisional government over the situation.

“We, along with other international donors, are in the process of providing humanitarian aid, and we are in discussions with the provisional government regarding their humanitarian requirements,” Crowley said. Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asian Affairs Robert Blake has also reached out to Kyrgyz authorities to determine if they need any nonhumanitarian assistance.

The United States is looking at how it can work within the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and with countries in the region “to provide assistance and help the provisional government stabilize the situation,” Crowley said.

Violence between Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbeks, who constitute nearly 1 million of Kyrgyzstan’s 5.5 million people, has raged since June 10 in southern Kyrgyzstan. According to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), more than 100 people have been killed and more than 1,200 injured since then, and an estimated 80,000 have fled their homes seeking to cross into neighboring Uzbekistan.

The ICRC launched a preliminary emergency appeal June 14 for funding to enable it to help 100,000 victims, according to a June 14 statement by the organization.

ICRC spokesman Pierre-Emmanuel Ducruet said that while the situation in the city of Osh had grown “a little calmer,” nearby Jalal-Abad has grown “very dangerous.” Osh, the second-largest city in Kyrgyzstan, is located in the southern portion of the country; many supporters of former president Kurmanbek Bakiyev are concentrated in the area. Bakiyev was ousted during [civil unrest in April](#) and the interim provisional government took over.

In southern Kyrgyzstan, “some areas are deserted and we believe many people are staying in their homes because they are too scared to leave,” Ducruet said.

At the OSCE’s Annual Security Review Conference in Vienna, Nancy McEldowney, the State Department’s principal deputy assistant secretary of state for European and Eurasian affairs, expressed concern over the deteriorating situation in Kyrgyzstan and offered condolences to the victims.

“This tragedy is a powerful reminder of the fact that we, the participating states of the OSCE have a responsibility to take all possible action to prevent these types of conflict, and to help resolve them once they occur,” she said.

McEldowney reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to the OSCE, and said she hopes delegates to the security review conference will use the occasion to “discuss, debate and decide upon practical ways to improve and expand the capacity of the OSCE to solve problems and enhance the lives of those who live throughout the OSCE space.”

---

## **6. Clinton on Anniversary of Iran's Disputed Presidential Election (06-14-2010)** **United State reaffirms its commitment to engage with Iran on all issues**

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Spokesman, June 12, 2010  
Statement by Secretary of State Clinton

### **Anniversary of Iran's Disputed Presidential Election**

When the Iranian people determined last year that their government had denied them their right to free and fair elections, thousands of Iranian citizens poured into the streets to protest peacefully. The Iranian authorities responded to their citizens’ call for accountability and transparency with violence, arbitrary detentions, dubious trials, and intimidation. One year later, many political prisoners continue to suffer in jail, some facing death sentences for expressing their opinions. Other civil society activists in Iran are not in prison, but they face other forms of persecution. Over the past year, many of Iran’s most accomplished journalists, academics, and activists felt they had no choice but to leave their homeland.

The Iranian government’s denial of the fundamental freedoms and rights accorded to its citizens in the Iranian constitution and international treaties to which Iran is a party has drawn broad international condemnation. As President Obama said when he accepted the Nobel Peace Prize, it is the responsibility of all free people and free nations to stand with peaceful reform movements seeking the rights that are our common birthright.

The United States once again calls on the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran to meet their obligations to their own people and to the international community by respecting the rights and dignity of their citizens and by fully upholding Iran's international obligations. We also call for the immediate release of all imprisoned human rights defenders, including Shiva Nazar Ahari, Narges Mohammadi, Emad Baghi, Kouhyar Goudarzi, Bahareh Hedayat, Milad Asadi, and Mahboubeh Karami. We ask the Iranian authorities to release the three American hikers, detained without charge for almost a year, and to provide information on the status of Mr. Robert Levinson, who disappeared in Iran in 2007.

The United States reaffirms its commitment to engage with Iran on all issues in pursuit of a negotiated diplomatic resolution, on the basis of mutual respect and mutual interests. But we also will continue to speak out in defense of basic human liberties and in support of those around the world who seek to exercise their universal rights.

---

## **7. Open Skies Treaty Fulfills Arms Control Needs (06-11-2010)**

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.  
Staff Writer

Washington — It may seem unusual to describe formalized treaties among nations as vital instruments in a toolbox. But in the somewhat arcane arena of arms control and nonproliferation, where the nuanced phrase and carefully chosen technical term is critical, the toolbox analogy is significant.

During three days of talks in Vienna, senior negotiators from 34 nations that stretch from Vancouver in the west to Vladivostok in the east met to assess implementation of the 10-year-old Open Skies Treaty — a step that is taken every five years. The treaty permits nations to conduct unarmed aerial observation flights over the territories of the treaty's members, with notification, as a practical means of verifying compliance with arms control and nonproliferation agreements.

Verification of treaty compliance is among the toughest challenges facing nations after a treaty enters into force. The Open Skies Treaty was designed to enhance understanding and confidence by giving all participants, regardless of their size, a direct role in gathering and sharing information.

Openness in matters of national security does not come easily, especially in a world where weapons of mass destruction are a factor and proliferation a constant threat.

Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller said June 9, at the close of the second review conference of the Open Skies Treaty, that it has become one of the most successful and valuable efforts to promote arms control openness. The United States served as chair of the review conference that was held June 7–9.

[Gottemoeller told delegates](#), “The United States believes that it is essential for the Open Skies Treaty to remain a vital instrument in our Euro-Atlantic conventional arms control toolbox.”

Gottemoeller is the State Department's assistant secretary for verification, compliance and implementation, and she and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Celeste Wallander served as co-chairwomen of the Open Skies review conference.

The consensus among members of the treaty coming out of the conference is for robust implementation, and the United States said it wants to consult with others in charting a new course for the treaty.

“The results of continued observation flights will contribute toward our security and stability as a group of nations,” Gottemoeller told delegates.

The timing of the treaty’s review conference was not lost on delegates, as it relates directly to events occurring in Europe, but also in the Middle East and in Northeast Asia, where the spread of nuclear weapons technology has become a central security issue.

[Wallander told delegates in earlier remarks](#) that the 34-nation treaty group is trying to evaluate the effectiveness of the treaty and support European security in an evolving political, economic and military environment.

“This is reflected in the reset in U.S.-Russian relations, the New START arms reduction Treaty between the United States and Russia, discussions about a new NATO Strategic Concept, and our collective efforts to respond to a new global security environment that focuses largely on transnational threats rather than conflict among states,” Wallander said.

Issues that will form the focus of further study include:

- Moving away from old film cameras to new digital sensors in all treaty categories.
- Updating the Open Skies fleet of aircraft used in aerial observation.
- Developing options for more shared observation flights by all members.
- Expanding membership of the treaty within the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.
- Determining if the imagery and other sensor data collected serve evolving security needs.

Gottemoeller told the delegates that the United States wants to work with treaty members on a five-year transition plan for the next review conference.

Wallander said the Open Skies Treaty faces two significant issues that have to be addressed now and in the next few years: an austere fiscal environment and the emerging digital era. The challenges intersect, she said.

All nations are facing more austere fiscal environments, and one means for sharing costs and reducing operating costs is through an international pool of aircraft and sensors, she said. The second challenge involves modernizing to an era that no longer relies on photographs that have to be developed in dark rooms, instead using imagery that can be taken by digital cameras and transmitted around the world in seconds.

“Apart from the up-front investment with upgrading to digital sensors, making that change will also require us to think through new implementation mechanisms and the costs associated with them,” Wallander said.

---



**8. Statement on Visit of Russian President Medvedev to White House (06-11-2010)**  
**Obama looks forward to discussing bilateral relations with Russia**

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary:

President Obama is pleased to welcome President Dmitriy Medvedev of the Russian Federation to the United States on June 22-24.

Over the last eighteen months, the United States and Russia have made significant strides in resetting relations between our two countries in ways that advance our mutual interests. Since first meeting in London in April 2009, President Obama and President Medvedev have collaborated closely to enhance the security and well-being of the American and Russian people, including the expansion of the Northern Distribution Network, which supplies our troops in Afghanistan; the signing of the New START Treaty, which reduces our nuclear arsenals, enhances transparency about our strategic forces, and demonstrates U.S. and Russian leadership in support of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; new sanctions against North Korea, designed to compel North Korea to adhere to its international obligations; the full and active pursuit of the dual track strategy that seeks Iran's compliance with its international obligations regarding its nuclear program, including most recently UN Security Council Resolution 1929; and the creation of a Bilateral President Commission, which has expanded dramatically the interactions among Americans and Russians on a whole range of issues, including emergency disaster response, space, counternarcotics, counterterrorism, energy efficiency, and trade and investment, among others.

President Obama looks forward to using this next meeting with President Medvedev to explore possible avenues of greater cooperation regarding trade, investment and innovation. The two Presidents will hold a bilateral meeting at the White House on June 24, where they will discuss these issues, as well as other issues of mutual concern leading into the G-8 and G-20 meetings. In conjunction with the visit, Russian and American business leaders, as well as American and Russian civil society leaders, will be holding their own meetings in Washington. As President Medvedev seeks to promote innovation and modernization in Russia, President Obama is pleased that the Russian President will begin his trip to the United States by visiting the Silicon Valley, and have the opportunity to review the unique set of factors that has fostered this important center of technological advancement and entrepreneurship.

---